

I. And now, sir, in the name of that Public Faith, which is the very ligament of civil society, and which the great Roman orator tells us is detestable to break even with an enemy, I arraign this scheme, and hold it up to the judgment of all who hear me. There is an early Italian story of an experienced citizen, who, when his nephew told him he had been studying at the University of Bologna, the science of right, said in reply, "You have spent your time to little purpose. It would have been better had you learned the science of might, for that is worth two of the other;" and the bystanders of that day all agreed that the veteran spoke the truth. I begin, sir, by assuming that honorable Senators will not act in this spirit—that they will not substitute might for right—that they will not wantonly and flagitantly discard any obligation, pledge, or covenant, because they chance to possess the power; but that, as honest men, desirous to do right, they will confront this question.

Sir, the proposition before you involves not merely the repeal of an existing law, but the infraction of solemn obligations originally proposed and assumed by the South, after a protracted and embittered contest, as a covenant of peace—with regard to certain specified territory therein described, namely: "All that Territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana;" according to which, in consideration of the admission into the Union of Missouri as a slave State, Slavery was forever prohibited in all the remaining part of this Territory which lies north of 36 deg. 30 min. This arrangement, between different sections of the Union—the Slave States of the second part—though usually known as the Missouri Compromise, was at the time styled a COMPACT. In its stipulations for Slavery, it was justly repugnant to the conscience of the North, and ought never to have been made; but it has on that side been performed. And now the upper-formed outstanding obligations to Freedom, originally proposed and assumed by the South, are resisted.

Years have passed since these obligations were embodied in the legislation of Congress, and accepted by the country. Meanwhile, the statesmen by whom they were framed and vindicated have, one by one, dropped from this earthly sphere. Their living voices cannot now be heard, to plead for the preservation of that Public Faith to which they were pledged. But this extraordinary lapse of time, with the complete fruition by one party of all the benefits belonging to it, under the compact, gives to the transaction an added and most sacred strength. Prescription steps in with new bonds, to confirm the original work; to the end that while men are mortal, controversies shall not be immortal. Death, with inexorable scythe, has mowed down the authors of this compact; but, with conservative hour-glass, it has counted out a succession of years, which now defile before us, like so many sentinels, to guard the sacred landmark of Freedom.

A simple statement of facts, derived from the journals of Congress and contemporary records, will show the origin and nature of this compact, the influence by which it was established, and the obligations which it imposed.

As early as 1818, at the first session of the fifteenth Congress, a bill was reported to the House of Representatives, authorizing the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, for the admission of such State into the Union; but, at that session, no final action was had thereon. At the next session, in February, 1819, the bill was again brought forward, when an eminent Representative of New York, whose life has been spared till this last summer, Mr. JAMES TALLMADGE, moved a clause prohibiting any further introduction of slaves into the proposed State, and securing freedom to the children born within the State after its admission into the Union, on attaining twenty-five years of age. This important proposition, which assumed a power not only to prohibit the ingress of Slavery into the State itself, but also to abolish it there, was passed in the affirmative, after a vehement debate of three days. On a division of the question, the first part, prohibiting the further introduction of slaves, was adopted by 87 yeas to 76 nays; the second part, providing for the emancipation of children, was adopted by 82 yeas to 78 nays. Other propositions to thwart the operation of these amendments were voted down, and on the 17th of February the bill was read a third time, and passed, with these important restrictions.

In the Senate, after debate, the provision for the emancipation of children was struck out by 31 yeas to 7 nays; the other provision, against the further introduction of Slavery, was struck out by 22 yeas to 16 nays. Thus emasculated, the bill was returned to the House, which, on March 2d, by a vote of 78 yeas to 76 nays, refused its concurrence. The Senate adhered to their amendments, and the House, by 78 yeas to 66 nays, adhered to their disagreement; and so at this session the Missouri bill was lost; and here was a temporary triumph of Freedom.

Meanwhile, the same controversy was renewed on the bill pending at the same time for the organization of the Territory of Arkansas, then known as the southern part of the Territory of Missouri. The restrictions already adopted in the Missouri bill were moved by Mr. TAYLOR, of New York, subsequently Speaker; but after at least six close votes, on the yeas and nays, in one of which the House was equally divided, 88 yeas to 88 nays, they were lost. Another proposition by Mr. TAYLOR, simpler in form, that Slavery should not hereafter be introduced into this Territory, was lost by 90 yeas to 86 yeas; and the Arkansas bill on February 25th was read the third time and passed. In the Senate, Mr. BURLINGAME, of Rhode Island, moved, as an amendment, the prohibition of the further introduction of Slavery into this Territory, which was lost by 19 yeas to 14 nays. And thus, without any provision for Freedom, Arkansas was organized as a Territory; and here was a triumph of Slavery.

At this same session, Alabama was ad-

mitted as a slave State, without any restriction or objection.

It was in the discussion on the "Arkansas bill," at this session, that we find the earliest suggestion of a Compromise. Defeated in his efforts to prohibit Slavery in the Territory, Mr. Taylor stated that "he thought it important that some line should be designated beyond which Slavery should not be permitted." He suggested its prohibition hereafter in all territories of the United States north of 36 deg. 30 min. north latitude. This proposition, though withdrawn after debate, was at once welcomed by Mr. LIVERMORE, of New Hampshire, "as made in the true spirit of compromise." It was opposed by Mr. Rhea, of Tennessee, on behalf of Slavery; who avowed himself against every restriction; and also by Mr. Ogle, of Pennsylvania, on behalf of Freedom, who was "against any Compromise by which Slavery, in any of the Territories, should be recognized or sanctioned by Congress." In this spirit it was opposed and supported by others among whom was General Harrison, afterwards President of the United States, who "assented to the expediency of establishing some such line of discrimination;" but proposed a line due west from the mouth of the Des Moines, thus constituting the northern, and not the southern boundary of Missouri, the partition line between Freedom and Slavery.

But this idea of Compromise, though suggested by Taylor, was thus early adopted and vindicated in this very debate, by an eminent character, Mr. LOUIS McLANE, of Delaware, who has since held high office in the country, and enjoyed no common measure of public confidence. Of all the leading actors in these early scenes, he and Mr. MERCER alone are yet spared. On this occasion he said:

"The fixing of a line on the west of the Mississippi, north of which Slavery should not be tolerated, had always been with him a favorite policy, and he hoped the day was not distant when, upon principles of fair compromise, it might constitutionally be effected. The present attempt he regarded as premature."

After opposing the restriction on Missouri, he concluded by declaring:

"At the same time, I do not mean to abandon the policy to which I alluded in the commencement of my remarks. I think it but fair that both sections of the Union should be accommodated on this subject, with regard to which so much feeling has been manifested. The same great motives of policy which reconciled and harmonized the jarring and discordant elements of our system originally, and which enabled the framers of our happy Constitution to compromise the different interests which then prevailed on this and other subjects, if properly cherished by us, will enable us to achieve similar objects. If we meet upon principles of reciprocity, we cannot fail to do justice to all. It has already been avowed, by gentlemen on this floor from the South and the West, that they will agree upon a line which shall divide the slaveholding from the non-slaveholding States. It is this proposition I am anxious to effect; but I wish to effect it by some compact which shall be binding upon all parties and all subsequent Legislatures, which cannot be changed, and will not fluctuate with the diversity of feeling and of sentiment to which this empire, in its march, must be destined. There is a vast and immense tract of country west of the Mississippi, yet to be settled, and intimately connected with the Northern section of the Union, upon which this Compromise can be effected."

The suggestions of Compromise were at this time vain; each party was determined. The North, by the prevailing voice of its representatives, claimed all for Freedom; the South, by its potential command of the Senate, claimed all for Slavery.

The report of this debate aroused the country. For the first time in our history, Freedom, after an animated struggle, hand to hand, had been kept up check by Slavery. The original policy of our Fathers in the restriction of Slavery was suspended, and this giant wrong threatened to stalk into all the broad national domain. Men at the North were humbled and amazed. The imperious demands of Slavery seemed incredible. Meanwhile, the whole subject was adjourned from Congress to the people. Through the press and at public meetings, an earnest voice was raised against the admission of Missouri into the Union without the restriction of Slavery. Judges left the bench and clergymen the pulpit, to swell the indignant protest which arose from good men, without distinction of party or of pursuit.

The movement was not confined to a few persons, nor to a few States. A public meeting, at Trenton, in New Jersey, was followed by others in New York and Philadelphia, and finally at Worcester, Salem, and Boston, where committees were organized to rally the country. The citizens of Baltimore, convened at the court-house, with the Mayor in the chair, resolved that the future admission of slaves into the States hereafter formed west of the Mississippi, ought to be prohibited by Congress. Villages, towns, and cities, by memorial, petition, and prayer, called upon Congress to maintain the great principle of the prohibition of Slavery. The same principle was also commended by the resolutions of State Legislatures; and Pennsylvania, inspired by the teachings of Franklin and the convictions of the respectable denomination of Friends, unanimously asserted at once the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit Slavery west of the Mississippi, and solemnly appealed to her sister States "to refuse to covenant with crime." New Jersey and Delaware followed, both also unanimously. Ohio asserted the same principle; so did also Indiana. The latter State, not content with providing for the future, severely censured one of its Senators, for his vote to organize Arkansas without the prohibition of Slavery. The resolutions of New York were reinforced by the recommendation of Dr. WITT CLINTON.

Amidst these excitements, Congress came together in December, 1819, taking possession of these Halls of the Capitol for the first time since their desolation by the British. On the day after the receipt of the President's Message, two several committees of the House were constituted, one to consider the application of Maine, and the other of Missouri, to enter the Union as separate and independent States. With only the delay of a single day, the bill for the admission of Missouri was reported to the House without the restriction of Slavery; but, as if shrinking

from the immediate discussion of the great question it involved, afterwards, on the motion of Mr. MERCER, of Virginia, its consideration was postponed for several weeks; all which, he it observed, is in open contrast with the manner in which the present discussion has been precipitated upon Congress. Meanwhile, the Maine bill, when reported to the House, was promptly acted upon, and sent to the Senate.

In the interval between the report of the Missouri bill and its consideration by the House, a committee was constituted, on motion of Mr. TAYLOR, of New York, to inquire into the expediency of prohibiting the introduction of Slavery into the Territories west of the Mississippi. This committee, at the end of a fortnight, was discharged from further consideration of the subject, which, it was understood, would enter into the postponed debate on the Missouri bill. This early effort to interdict Slavery in the Territories by a special law is worthy of notice, on account of some of the expressions of opinion which it drew forth. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Taylor declared, that

"He presumed there were no members, he knew of none, who doubted the constitutional power of Congress to impose such a restriction on the Territories."

A generous voice from Virginia recognised at once the right and duty of Congress. This was from Charles Fenton Mercer, who declared that

"When the question proposed should come fairly before the House, he should support the proposition. He should record his vote against suffering the dark cloud of inhumanity, which now darkened his country, from rolling on beyond the peaceful shores of the Mississippi."

At length, on the 26th January, 1820, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Missouri Bill, and proceeded with its discussion, day by day, till the 28th of February, when it was reported back with amendments. But meanwhile the same question was presented to the Senate, where a conclusion was reached earlier than in the House. A clause for the admission of Missouri was tacked to the Maine bill. To this an amendment was moved by Mr. Roberts, of Pennsylvania, prohibiting the further introduction of Slavery into the State, which, after a fortnight's debate, was defeated by 27 yeas to 18 nays.

The debate in the Senate was of unusual interest and splendor. It was especially illustrated by an effort of transcendent power from that great lawyer and orator, William Pinkney. Recently returned from a succession of missions to foreign courts, and at this time the acknowledged chief of the American bar, particularly skilled in questions of constitutional law, his course as a Senator from Maryland was calculated to produce a profound impression. In a speech which drew to this chamber an admiring throng for two days, and which at the time was fondly compared with the best examples of Greece and Rome, he first authoritatively proposed and developed the Missouri Compromise. His masterly effort was mainly directed against the restriction upon Missouri, but it began and ended with the idea of compromise. "Notwithstanding," he says, "occasional appearances of rather an unfavorable description, I have long since persuaded myself that the Missouri question, as it is called, might be laid to rest, with innocence and safety, by some conciliatory compromise at least, by which, as is our duty, we might reconcile the extremes of conflicting views and feelings, without any sacrifice of constitutional principles." And he closed with the hope that the restriction on Missouri would not be passed, but that the whole question "might be disposed of in a manner satisfactory to all, by a prospective prohibition of Slavery in the Territory to the north and west of Missouri."

This authoritative proposition of Compromise, from the most powerful advocate of the unconditional admission of Missouri, was made in the Senate on the 21st of January. From various indications, it seems to have found prompt favor in that body. Finally, on the 17th of February, the union of Maine and Missouri in one bill prevailed there, by 23 yeas to 21 nays. On the next day, Mr. Thomas, of Illinois, who had always voted with the South against any restriction upon Missouri, introduced the famous clause prohibiting Slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min., which now constitutes the eighth section of the Missouri act. An effort was made to include the Arkansas Territory within this prohibition; but the South united against this extension of the area of Freedom, and it was defeated by 24 yeas to 20 nays. The prohibition, as moved by Mr. THOMAS, then prevailed, by 34 yeas to only 10 nays. Among those in the affirmative were both the Senators from each of the slave States, Louisiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, Delaware, Maryland, and Alabama, and also one of the Senators from each of the slave States, Mississippi and North Carolina, including in the honorable list the familiar names of William Pinkney, James Brown, and William Rufus King.

This bill, as thus amended, is the first legislative embodiment of the Missouri Compact or Compromise, the essential conditions of which were, the admission of Missouri as a State, without any restriction of Slavery; and the prohibition of Slavery in all the remaining Territory of Louisiana north of 36 deg. 30 min. This bill, thus composed, containing these two propositions—this double measure—finally passed the Senate by a test vote of 24 yeas to 20 nays. The yeas embraced every Southern Senator, except Nathaniel Macon, of North Carolina, and William Smith, of South Carolina. The nays embraced every Northern Senator, except the two Senators from Rhode Island, and one from New Hampshire. And this, sir, is the record of the first stage in the adoption of the Missouri Compromise. First openly announced and vindicated on the floor of the Senate, by a distinguished Southern statesman, it was forced on the North by an almost unanimous Southern vote.

While things had thus culminated in the Senate, discussion was still proceeding in the other House on the original Missouri bill. This was for a moment arrested by the reception from the Senate of the Maine bill, embodying the Missouri Compromise. Upon this action was at

once had, the Compromise was rejected, and the bill left in its original condition. This was done by large votes. Even the prohibition of Slavery was thrown out by 159 yeas to 18 nays, both the North and the South uniting against it. The Senate, on receiving the bill back from the House, insisted on their amendments. The House in turn insisted on their disagreement. According to parliamentary usage, a Committee of Conference between the two Houses was appointed. Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois, Mr. PINKNEY, of Maryland, and Mr. JAMES BARBOUR, of Virginia, composed this important committee on the part of the Senate; and Mr. HOLMES, of Maine, Mr. TAYLOR, of New York, Mr. LOWNDES, of South Carolina, Mr. PARKER, of Massachusetts, and Mr. KINSEY, of New Jersey, on the part of the House.

Meanwhile, the House had voted on the original Missouri bill. An amendment, peremptorily interdicting all Slavery in the new State, was adopted by 94 yeas to 88 nays; and thus the bill passed the House, and was sent to the Senate, March 1st. Thus, after an exasperated and protracted discussion, the two Houses were at a dead-lock. The double-headed Missouri Compromise, was the ultimatum of the Senate. The restriction of Slavery in Missouri, involving, of course, its prohibition in the unorganized Territories, was the ultimatum of the House.

At this stage, on the 2d of March, the Committee of Conference made their report, which was urged at once upon the House by Mr. LOWNDES, the distinguished Representative from South Carolina, and one of her most precious sons, who objected to a motion to print, on the ground "that it would imply a determination in the House to delay a decision of the subject to-day, which he had hoped the House was fully prepared for." The question then came, on striking out the restriction in the Missouri bill. The report in the *National Intelligencer* says:

"Mr. LOWNDES spoke briefly in support of the Compromise recommended by the Committee of Conference, and urged with great earnestness the propriety of a decision which would restore tranquility to the country, which was demanded by every consideration of discretion, of moderation, of wisdom, and of virtue."

"Mr. MERCER, of Virginia, followed on the same side with great earnestness, and had spoken about half an hour, when he was compelled by indisposition to resume his seat."

In conformity with this report, this disturbing question was at once put at rest. Maine and Missouri were each admitted into the Union as independent States. The restriction of Slavery in Missouri was abandoned by a vote in the House of 90 yeas to 87 nays; and the prohibition of Slavery in all Territories north of 36 deg. 30 min., exclusive of Missouri, was substituted by a vote of 134 yeas to 42 nays. Among the distinguished Southern names in the affirmative, are Louis McLane, of Delaware, Samuel Smith, of Maryland, William Lowndes, of South Carolina, and Charles Fenton Mercer, of Virginia. The title of the Missouri bill was amended, by adding the words, "and to prohibit Slavery in certain Territories." The bills then passed both Houses without a division; and on the morning of the 3d March, 1820, the *National Intelligencer* contained an exulting article, entitled: "The Question Settled."

Another paper, published in Baltimore, immediately after the passage of the Compromise, vindicated it as a perpetual compact, which could not be disturbed. The language is so clear and strong that I will read it, although it has been already quoted by my friend from Ohio, [Mr. CHASE]:

"It is true the Compromise is supported only by the letter of the law, repeatable by the authority which enacted it; but the circumstances of the case give this law a MORAL FORCE equal to that of a positive provision of the Constitution; and we do not hazard anything by saying that the Constitution exists in its observance. Both parties have sacrificed much to conciliation. We seek to see the compact kept in good faith, and we trust that a kind Providence will open the way to relieve us of an evil which every good citizen deprecates as the supreme curse of the country."—*Niles's Register*.

The distinguished leaders in this settlement were all from the South. As early as February, 1819, LOUIS McLANE, of Delaware, had urged it upon Congress, "by some compact binding upon all subsequent legislatures." It was in 1820 brought forward and upheld in the Senate by WILLIAM PINKNEY, of Maryland, and passed in that body by the vote of every Southern Senator except two, against the vote of every Northern Senator except four. The Committee of Conference, through which it finally prevailed, was filled, on the part of the Senate, with inflexible partisans of the South, such as might fitly represent the sentiments of its President *pro tem*, John Gaillard, a Senator from South Carolina; on the part of the House, it was nominated by HENRY CLAY, the Speaker, and Representative from Kentucky. This committee, thus constituted, drawing its double life from the South, was unanimous in favor of the Compromise. A private letter from Mr. PINKNEY, written at the time, and preserved by his distinguished biographer, shows that the report made by the committee came from him:

"The bill for the admission of Missouri into the Union (without restriction as to Slavery) may be considered as past. That bill was sent back again this morning from the House, with the restriction as to Slavery. The Senate voted to amend it by striking out the restriction, (27 to 15,) and proposed, as another amendment, that we should have the advantage of a restriction upon the recent territory to the north and west, as to Slavery. To-night the House of Representatives have agreed to both of these amendments, in opposition to their former votes, and this affair is settled. To-morrow we shall (of course) recede from our amendments as to Maine, (our object being effected,) and both States will be admitted. This happy result has been accomplished by the Conference, of which I was a member on the part of the Senate, and of which I proposed the report which has been made."

Thus again the Compromise takes its life from the South. Proposed in the committee by Mr. PINKNEY, it was urged on the House of Representatives, with great earnestness, by Mr. Lowndes, of South Carolina, and Mr. Mercer, of Virginia; and here again is the most persuasive voice of the South. When passed by Congress, it next came before the President, James Monroe, of Virginia, for his approval, who did not

sign it till after the unanimous opinion of his Cabinet, in writing, composed of John Quincy Adams, William H. Crawford, Smith Thompson, John C. Calhoun, and William Wirt—a majority of whom were Southern men—that the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories was constitutional. Thus yet again the Compromise takes its life from the South.

As the Compromise took its life from the South, so the South, in the judgment of its own statesmen at the time, and according to unquestionable facts, was the conquering party. It gained at once its darling object, the admission of Missouri as a slave State; and subsequently the admission of Arkansas, also as a slave State. From the crushed and humbled North, it received more than the full consideration stipulated in its favor. On the side of the North the contract has been more than executed. And now the South refuses to perform the part which it originally proposed and assumed. With the consideration in its pocket, it repudiates the bargain which it forced upon the country. This, sir, is a simple statement of the present question.

A subtle German has declared, that he could find heresies in the Lord's Prayer; and I believe it is only in this spirit that any law can be found in the existing obligations of this compact. As late as 1848, in the discussions of this body, the Senator from Virginia, who sits behind me, [Mr. MASON,] while condemning it in many aspects, says:

"Yet as it was agreed to as a Compromise by the South for the sake of the Union, I would be the last to disturb it."—*Congressional Globe, Appendix, 1st session, 30th Congress, Vol. 19, p. 887.*

Even this distinguished Senator recognised it as an obligation which he would not disturb. And, though disbelieving the original constitutionality of the arrangement, he was clearly right. I know, sir, that it is in form simply a legislative act; but as the Act of Settlement in England, declaring the rights and liberties of the subject and settling the succession of the Crown, has become a permanent part of the British Constitution, irrevocable by any common legislation, so this act, under all the circumstances attending its passage, also by long acquiescence and the complete performance of its conditions by one party, has become a part of our fundamental law, irrevocable by any common legislation. As well might Congress at this moment undertake to overhaul the original purchase of Louisiana, as unconstitutional, and now, on this account, thrust away that magnificent heritage, with all its cities, states, and territories, teeming with civilization. The Missouri Compact, in its unperformed obligations to Freedom, stands at this day as impregnable as the Louisiana purchase.

I appeal to Senators about me, not to disturb it. I appeal to the Senators from Virginia, to keep inviolate the compact made in their behalf by JAMES BARBOUR and CHARLES FENTON MERCER. I appeal to the Senators from South Carolina, to guard the word of JOHN GAILLARD and WILLIAM LOWNDES. I appeal to the Senators from Maryland, to uphold the Compromise which elicited the constant support of Samuel Smith, and was first triumphantly pressed by the unsurpassed eloquence of Pinkney. I appeal to the Senators from Delaware, to maintain the landmark of Freedom in the Territory of Louisiana, early espoused by Louis McLane. I appeal to the Senators from Kentucky, not to repudiate the pledges of Henry Clay. I appeal to the Senators from Alabama, not to break the agreement sanctioned by the earliest votes in the Senate of their late most cherished fellow-citizen, William Rufus King.

Sir, Congress may now set aside this obligation, repudiate this pledged faith, annul this compact; and some of you, forgetful of the majesty of honest dealing, in order to support Slavery, may consider it advantageous to use this power. To all such let me commend a familiar story: An eminent leader in antiquity, Themistocles, once announced to the Athenian Assembly, that he had a scheme to propose, highly beneficial to the State, but which could not be expounded to the many. Aristides, surnamed the Just, was appointed to receive the secret, and to report upon it. His brief and memorable judgment was, that, while nothing could be more advantageous to Athens, nothing could be more unjust; and the Athenian multitude, responding at once, rejected the proposition. It appears that it was proposed to burn the combined Greek fleet, which then rested in the security of peace in a neighboring sea, and thus confirm the naval supremacy of Athens. A similar proposition is now brought before the American Senate. You are asked to destroy a safeguard of Freedom, consecrated by solemn compact, under which the country is now reposing in the security of peace, and thus confirm the supremacy of Slavery. To this institution and its partisans it may seem to be advantageous; but nothing can be more unjust. Let the judgment of the Athenian multitude be yours.

This is what I have to say on this head. I now pass to the second branch of the argument.

[TO BE CONCLUDED TO-MORROW.]

It is said—but can it be true?—that a member of Congress who is known to be committed against the practice of duelling, is more liable to insult at Washington, than one who has no scruples on the subject.

THE STORM LAST NIGHT
PREVENTED many friends from attending the Hutchinsons' concert, and therefore they will give one more, and positively the last for the season.

AT CLARETS HALL.
THIS (TUESDAY) EVENING, FEBRUARY 21, introducing a choice variety of their own compositions and best selections, which have received the applause from everybody who ever heard them, in Great Britain and Ireland, and the universal Yankee nation.

Tickets 50 cents. Doors open at 7½ o'clock; concert commencing at 8 o'clock. No postponement unless the weather is worse than last night, and the best seats reserved for those who come first.

LADIES' INSTITUTE.
OF THE PENN MEDICAL UNIVERSITY of Philadelphia.

THE SPRING SESSION commences on the 1st of Monday in March, and continues four months. The teachings are thorough, liberal, and practical. The entire expenses of the session, exclusive of boarding and graduating fee, will not exceed \$50. For particulars and announcements, address—JOS. S. LONGSHORE, M. D. Dean, Feb. 21—w6t Box 1,683, Phil. Post Office.

CONGRESS.

THIRTY THIRD CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

In the Senate, yesterday, after Mr. Pettit had concluded, Mr. Cass rejoined; when Mr. Sumner obtained the floor, and moved that the further consideration be postponed until to-day; and the Senate adjourned.

In the House, Mr. Preston concluded his speech, and Mr. James C. Allen obtained the floor, when the Committee rose. The Speaker then laid before the House a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting lists of clerks and other persons employed in his Department during the last year; which was laid on the table and ordered to be printed. The House then adjourned.

Senate, Tuesday, February 21, 1854.

Mr. Bayard presented five petitions, praying that in the establishment of Nebraska, and of other Territorial Governments, Congress will frame them on the principle of non-intervention by Congress with the subject of Slavery in the Territories.

On motion by Mr. Pearce, the President of the Senate was authorized to fill the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, occasioned by the expiration of the term of the Hon. R. M. Charlton, of Georgia.

On motion by Mr. Foot, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill granting land to the several States, for the support and maintenance of the indigent insane.

Mr. Foot briefly explained the bill, and in feeling and eloquent terms pointed out the humane character of the bill, and the moral heresies of the noble-hearted lady (Miss Dix) who had so long and urgently pressed this motion.

The hour of one having arrived, the bill was postponed, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill providing a Territorial Government for Nebraska.

Mr. Cass made some additional observations in reply to the remarks made yesterday by Mr. Pettit.

Mr. Sumner then addressed the Senate.

House of Representatives, Feb. 21, 1854.

Mr. Warren, on leave, explained, in behalf of the Committee on Public Lands, that that committee was not opposed to modifying the Bounty Land laws; but that the bill yesterday reported back by them proposed to make no distinction as to length of service, and was therefore deemed by the committee unequal and unjust.

On motion of Mr. Campbell, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Olds in the chair.

Mr. J. C. Allen, of Illinois, addressed the Committee in support of the Nebraska bill. He commenced by answering the question, What was the Missouri Compromise? He said that Missouri was not admitted by virtue of the so-called Missouri Compromise. The Compromise grew out of the excitement produced by the admission of that State.

A line was drawn, north of which Slavery should not go, and by implication, south of which it might exist. He argued that the prohibition should not operate upon the States formed out of this territory.

He quoted from the language of Mr. Clay to show that he had not of late years even approved of that Compromise.

The power of Congress to legislate upon the subject had been claimed by the gloomy-dreaded Abolition hypocrites of the North, without respect to this Compromise; yet they now profess to reverence it.

Mr. Giddings. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Allen. When I have finished my speech, I will answer any questions gentlemen may please to ask me.

Mr. A. proceeded to show that the present bill, if passed, silence all interference on the subject. Non-intervention will be the principle of our guidance.

He dwelt upon the incompatibility of the Compromises of 1820 and 1850. He contended that the former was intended to govern the States after their creation and organization; which was unconstitutional, and should have been, and was, repealed in 1850. The principle of self-government was involved, and the people would defend that principle.

He maintained that both the Conventions in Baltimore, in 1852, endorsed the principles of the Compromise of 1850, and, therefore, of this bill. The friends of this bill are not the producers of excitement. What they ask, was established in 1850. They ask an adherence to existing obligations. Utah and New Mexico were received on the terms now asked. The present agitators are the men who prostituted their places in Congress, the stump, the press, and the sacred pulpit, to disseminate Abolitionism. He said such Abolition agitators should be crushed out of this Congress.

He avowed the belief that Slavery never would go into these Territories. There would be three Yankees to one Southern emigrant there.

Mr. Dent, of Georgia, followed, and said that he felt it to be his duty, though a new member, and unaccustomed to the business of legislative bodies, to oppose the Homestead bill, now before this body. The bill is unfair and unjust. The pauper population of Europe are thus invited to come to our shores.

Mr. Dawson here stated that the provision only embraced those here now.

Mr. Dent proceeded. He would bestow the lands upon none but those who had fought for them. A man for giving land away had grown up, and it ought to be checked. Foreigners, paupers, and bob-tailed fellows, lazy to work—were to receive this land.

Railroad and other favored companies were also receiving the lands. But he averred that the lands were not the property of the General Government. It held them in trust, and should administer the trust faithfully. The favor shown to the new States was unfair. The policy was not democratic. Neither the lands nor the proceeds of their sale should be thus used.

He was in favor of free trade, and wanted to create no necessity for a tariff. We owe debts—debts of honor—to portions of our own people. Our bounty land laws are unequal and unjust. Many are unrewarded. Seek out the men of merit and reward them, but do not throw away your wealth.

The great idea of Sumner's bills is to carry everything by log-rolling; and private interests are said to influence members; but he hoped that the thought it would be better for the General Government to make the roads itself, and then sell the lands at such enhanced prices as they would bring. He believed he could speak the sentiments of Georgia. Her people would sanction no plan for giving away for lands, not even to build a Pacific Railroad, for such a road would not be national, but sectional; it would benefit the region through which it might run.

He was the friend of all kinds of improvements, but he wished to see them made in a legitimate manner. Railroad companies should prosecute their enterprises as other people do; their enterprises should pay.

Mr. Grow addressed the Committee on the same subject. He saw no objection to giving a home to those who come to our shores from other climes. These people will come; we have room for them; why not induce them to leave the purities of our cities, and establish themselves upon such homes as they will cling to and improve?

Mr. Grow was still speaking when our report closed.

Dried currants are not currants at all; but small grapes of the Corinth species.

[BY HOUSE'S PRINTING TELEGRAPH] TELEGRAPHIC CORRESPONDENCE FOR DAILY NATIONAL ERA.

The Storm—Influence on Business—All Travelling Between Cities Interrupted—Depth of Snow, &c.

BALTIMORE, FEB. 21.—The snow storm, the deepest which has been here for many years, interrupts all modes of conveyance except the telegraph, and some of the telegraph lines are not working.

No mails have arrived or departed from Baltimore since noon yesterday. The snow is now ten inches deep on a level, and in some places it has drifted five feet deep, but the warm sun will soon melt it away, the ground not being frozen.

Several trains of cars are detained between Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York.

Nothing has been done in the Baltimore market to-day. All is unsettled, and it is impossible to give prices.

The 3½ o'clock train from Washington, of yesterday afternoon, arrived at eleven o'clock this morning, having been eighteen hours en route.

NEW YORK, FEB. 21.—It stormed all day yesterday. Snow 4 feet deep. Mails failed from every direction. All the mail trains detained by the depth of snow.

BUFFALO, FEB. 21.—Snow storm yesterday very severe. Snow seven feet deep. Difficult motion about.

ALBANY, FEB. 21.—Snow storm severe, and snow deep.

BOSTON, FEB. 21.—The snow storm is very severe. Mails in all directions detained by the depth of snow.

PHILADELPHIA, FEB. 21.—The snow storm here is more severe than for many years. Accounts from Pittsburgh, Wheeling, and the Northern cities, describe the storm as very severe, the depth of snow ranging from twelve inches to six feet. No mails to